REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow. After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 15-38 are now pending in this application.

Claim 38 has been added.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given to the claims.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The Examiner finds that the drawings do not show that "the entry region is axially symmetrical" as required in claims 17, 29 and 34. FIG. 7 has been added to clearly show that the division in the entry region is axially symmetrical as claimed in claim 17. The new figure is a cross sectional view of the entry region 10 shown in figures 4 and 5. Support for this addition can be found in FIGS. 4 and 5 as well as in the specification at paragraph 7.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 15-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

As to claims 15, 28 and 33, the Examiner finds that it is not clear whether the Applicants intend to refer specifically to the air recited in line 2 to or to any air generally. Claims 15, 28 and 33 have been amended to show that the air referred to is the air recited in line 2.

As to claims 16, 29 and 34, the Examiner alleges that it is not clear what "significant' means. These claims have been amended to remove the word "significant" and explain that the change referred to is a change in the axial direction.

The Examiner alleges that claims 17, 29, and 34 are indefinite because they recite 'axially symmetrical" but no axis is defined. Claims 17, 29 and 34 have been amended to clarify that the division in the entry region is symmetrical about a plane formed by a longitudinal center axis of the air duct and a line perpendicular to the longitudinal center axis of the air duct located between the subducts. The plane described in amended claims 17, 29 and 34 is the same plane that is disclosed in paragraph 7 of the specification.

The Examiner alleges that the text of claim 19 is unclear. Claim 19 has been amended to clarify the claim meaning.

No change in scope is intended by these amendments.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 15-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Kazuya (JP60110522 A). For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submits that the rejection is improper.

The Examiner finds that Kazuya teaches "a plurality of subducts (4, 5) for dividing air in the airguiding device, and an outflow region (1) with an outer circumferential region (connected to 5) and a middle region (at 4) and, wherein one subduct (4) leads to the middle region and another subduct (5) leads to the outer circumferential region." The Examiner points to element 4 as both the middle region and the subduct. However, the air inlet of claim 15 comprises both a middle region ***and*** a plurality of subducts. The specification states that "[t]he air-guiding device is preferably designed in such a manner that in the outlet region of the air duct a middle region of the air duct and an outer region of the air duct are provided, and air can be fed to these regions through different subducts." Paragraph 9. The middle

region element is not a subduct, nor is it in a subduct. Kazuya does not teach a middle region and therefore does not anticipate claim 15.

In addition, the Examiner finds that Kazuya teaches an outer circumferential region (connected to 5). However, the element 5 pointed to by the Examiner is actually a series of four separate regions (51-54). These four regions are not a circumferential region as defined in the instant specification. The specification explains the function of the circumferential region: "a spot action can preferably be imparted to the air at the exit with the aid of one of the subducts and a swirl can be imparted to the air at the exit with the aid of another subduct. . . ." Paragraph 9. A swirl could not possibly be imparted to the air within element 5 of Kazuya, since it is divided into four distinct regions. Therefore, Kazuya does not teach an outer circumferential region and does not anticipate claim 15.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Kazuya does not anticipate or render obvious claims 16-27, which depend on claim 15. Favorable reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Rejection based on JP10246500 and JP60110522

Claims 15-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yasushi (JP10246500) in view of Kazuya. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claims 15, 28 and 33 render these rejections moot. The Examiner alleges that "Yasushi shows an air duct for supplying air 10; an air guiding device (the upstream portion of 10 generally) comprising a plurality of subducts for dividing air (subduct 11, and subducts created between vanes 13 through which flow B occurs-see figs. 1a, b and c)." However, the Examiner indicated that, in examining the claims, "air" was interpreted to mean any air generally. As explained above, claims 15, 28 and 33 have been amended to show that the air referred to throughout the claim is the air recited in line 2 of the claims. In Yasushi, the air divided into the vane guides 13, which allegedly corresponds to the subducts, is not the same air as the air supplied by element 10, which allegedly corresponds to the air duct for supplying air. Therefore, Yasushi does not teach "a plurality of subducts dividing said air" as

required by claims 15, 28 and 33 and Yasushi cannot be combined with Kazuya to render claims 15, 28 and 33 unpatentable.

For at least the reasons discussed above, the combination of Yasushi in view of Kazuya does not render claims 15-38 unpatentable because this combination does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claims 15, 28 and 33. Favorable reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection based on DC10036776 and EP1332899

Claims 15-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Andreas (DC10036776) in view of Meneghin (EP1332899). Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claims 15, 28 and 33 render these rejections moot. The Examiner alleges that "Andreas shows an air duct 7 for supplying air; and an air guiding device comprising a plurality of subducts (central subduct 8 and outer subduct 9) for dividing air." However, the Examiner indicated that, in examining the claims, "air" was interpreted to mean any air generally. As explained above, claims 15, 28 and 33 have been amended to show that the air referred to throughout the claim is the air recited in line 2 of the claims. In Yasushi, the air divided into elements 8 and 9, which allegedly corresponds to the subducts, is does not come from the same duct.

In addition, elements 7, which the Examiner alleges is an air duct for supplying air, is actually a more general element indicating the double-nozzle as a whole. Andreas does not disclose an air duct for supplying air as required in claims 15, 28 and 33.

For at least the reasons discussed above, the combination of Andreas in view of Meneghin does not render claims 15-38 unpatentable because this combination does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claims 15, 28 and 33. Favorable reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 23, 2010

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-4787
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Chase J. Brill
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 61,378